



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

for the recovery of damages for the numerous breaches of contract, but protection of the business of complainants from loss suffered and to be suffered by frauds committed and to be committed. The court therefore entertained no doubt of its jurisdiction, as the amount involved is the continuing loss to be prevented from the fraudulent use of these void papers. *Railway Co. v. Kutean*, 54 Fed. 552; *Scott v. Donald*, 165 U. S. 107. A close analogy is furnished in trade-mark and patent cases. The "age-worn" objection of novelty is urged against the serving of the writ of injunction in this case also. A similar objection was overruled in *Toledo, A. A. & N. M. Ry. Co. v. Penn. Co.*, 54 Fed. 751, also in the famous Strike Cases, arising out of the contempt proceedings in *U. S. v. Debs*, 64 Fed. 724. See also *In re Debs*, 158 U. S. 565; *Shoe Co. v. Saxey*, 131 Mo. 212; *Scott v. Donald*, supra; *Arthur v. Oakes*, 63 Fed. 310; *Davis v. Zimmerman*, 36 N. Y. Supp. 303, and *Lumley v. Wagner*, 6 Eng. Ruling Cas. 652.

*Taxation—Exemption.*—*Etna Ins. Co. v. Mayor, etc., of City of New York*, 47 N. E. Rep. 593 (N. Y.). Laws 1886 (N. Y.) whereby certain property of insurance companies is exempted from taxation, held not to apply in that year, the taxes having already been assessed but not actually levied. This is so upon authority of *In re American Fine Arts Society*, 151 N. Y. 621, where the act took effect on May 3d, and the assessment was made on May 1st, but not actually levied. Also in *Assn. for Benefit of Colored Orphans v. Mayor, etc., of New York*, 104 N. Y. 581, the same doctrine is applied where the plaintiff became the owner of the property after May 1st, and before the tax was actually imposed.

*Foreign Corporations—Compliance with Statute.*—*New York Nat. Building & Loan Ass'n, v. Connor*, 41 S. W. 1054 (Tenn.). Prior to the passage of a statute describing the terms upon which a foreign corporation could do business within the State, the defendant became a stockholder in the plaintiff company, a foreign building and loan association, and applied for a loan therein. After the passage of such a statute and before the plaintiff had complied with its terms, the loan was made and a mortgage taken as security. Held, that the mortgage was illegal and unenforceable, even though the borrower may have acquired a vested right to the loan and the association under obligation to make it. The making of the loan and giving the mortgage were not merely the winding up of unfinished business.

*Water Companies—Condition of Furnishing Water.*—*Crumley v. Watauga Water Co.*, 41 S. W. Rep. 1058 (Tenn.). A water company, duly organized and chartered under a general State law and clothed with the power of condemnation, is a quasi-public corporation and must furnish water to all who apply therefor and tender the legal rates. Such a corporation cannot justify its action in refusing to furnish one water on his refusal to pay a due-bill for water furnished a year or two previously. The company had given him its credit by accepting a duebill and could not thereafter coerce payment by denying a present legal right.

*Statutes—Special Acts—Constitutional Law—Legislative Control of Cities.*—*Restrictions on Use of Property, City of St. Louis v. Dorr*, 41 S. W. Rep. 1095 (Mo.). An act of the legislature of Missouri prescribed that "all cities in the state having a population of three hundred thousand or more \* \* \* are hereby authorized to establish boulevards and provide for maintaining the same \* \* \* and may exclude the institution and